WORKING DRAFT – 10/27/2026 – 10 pm

If you have questions, please contact K. Sivakumar ("Siva") (kasg@lehigh.edu).

MEETING OF THE LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting held on October 2, 2026, at 1:10 pm

CUC 375 and Via Zoom

Do the Minutes include approved R&P Changes? Yes/~~No~~
Do the Minutes include items ready for a vote of the entire Lehigh Faculty? ~~Yes~~/No
Are there items requiring Board of Trustees approval? – ~~Yes~~/No
Are there items requiring Board of Trustees notification? Yes/~~No~~

Appendix 1 lists the roster of senators present at the meeting.

[Appendix 1 available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes]

1. Minutes of the Prior Faculty Senate Meeting

The minutes of the 09/04/2026 Senate Meeting were included in the consent calendar. The minutes were approved, as no one requested separate discussion.

The approved minutes are available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes.

2. Correction of administrative error: R&P 3.21.1

Professor Jenna Lay noted that some sections in R&P 3.21.1 were inadvertently deleted when recent changes were incorporated. It was purely an administrative error. The goal is to simply reinstate those sections that were accidentally deleted. No other changes are proposed. The Faculty Senate had no objection to restoring the missing text to correct the administrative error. Details are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/R%26P%203.21.1%20-%20September%202026%20Fix%20-%20Google%20Docs.pdf

3. Second Reading: R&P 1.3.4.1 (and associated sections): Arts and Libraries Faculty Committee

Details are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/R%26P%20Changes%20related%20to%20recent%20reorganization%20(Arts%20and%20Libraries).docx%20-%20Google%20Docs_0.pdf

The proposal was moved and seconded. The salient points discussed were as follows.

- We need to include all divisions in the College of Arts & Sciences, recognize the new administrative structure for arts at Lehigh, recognize all colleges at Lehigh, and streamline the language because of the administrative changes that separated technology services from library services. [Professors Joseph Amodei and Anders Knospe, Vice Provost for Arts and Libraries Greg Reihman]

- There is a need to clarify the nature and extent of faculty oversight under the new committee structure to ensure that faculty voice is heard in the administration of the arts, libraries, and technology services and the transition to the new administrative structure is smooth. [Professors Dean Caivano, Jenna Lay, Mike Spear, and Ke Yang]

- Some streamlining of the committee structure is needed because of the recent structural changes (e.g., CITL moving to the Office of Vice Provost for Educational Innovation and Assessment). [Vice Provost for Arts and Libraries Greg Reihman]

- A working group of the Faculty Senate is reviewing the committee structure. [Professor Jenna Lay]

- It is important to clarify concerns before moving forward with committee formation. [Professors Joseph Amodei, Angela Hicks, and Mike Spear]

Professor Angela Hicks moved to postpone the discussion to a subsequent meeting to provide time for revisions to address the concerns raised. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and passed.

4. Discussion: Annual Review Process for Graduate Students

Deputy Provost for Graduate Education Sabrina Jedlicka and Registrar Michael Dills-Allen initiated a discussion. The following were the salient points from the discussion.

- The goal is to establish a process with sufficient flexibility for departments and colleges to track student progress and dismiss students from the program if milestones are not met. The objective is not to disrupt current practices but to ensure all departments conduct regular annual reviews. [Deputy Provost for Graduate Education Sabrina Jedlicka]

- Because this is an institutional record, we should protect students' procedural rights and clearly articulate appeal processes. [Professors Subhrajit Bhattacharya, Dean Caivano, Jenna Lay, and Amirtaha Taebi]

- These protections are already reflected in the FERPA rights. [Registrar Michael Dills-Allen]

- There is a need to clarify the applicability of the process for master's students who are not on a thesis track. [Professor Subhrajit Bhattacharya]

- Streamlined degree audits and some backend automation can simplify the process. [Deputy Provost for Graduate Education Sabrina Jedlicka in response to the workload concerns in large master's program raised by Professors Al Bodzin, Tom Hammond, and Chris Liang]

- We are initiating these procedures early because once the federal guidelines are officially announced, universities will have limited time to implement them. Furthermore, although the impetus for these changes came from the federal policy related to the duration of status, establishing these procedures is still a beneficial administrative practice. [Deputy Provost for Graduate Education Sabrina Jedlicka in response to Professor Khurram Hussain's point about waiting until the federal guidelines are officially available]

- It is important for the departments to update the catalog to provide all relevant details about their graduate programs. [Deputy Provost for Graduate Education Sabrina Jedlicka and Registrar Michael Dills-Allen]

5. Second Reading: R&P 3.1.8, 3.21.8, 3.21.9: Normal Academic Progress

The item was moved and seconded. Details are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/New%20R%26P%20Language_%20Normal%20Academic%20Progress%20(3.1.8%3B%203.21.8%3B%203.21.9)%20-%20Google%20Docs.pdf

Professor LaToya Council moved an amendment to reference section 3.22.1 in the document to clarify the timeframe for master's programs. The language is "The progress milestones recorded in the annual review will follow university regulations for master's programs, as outlined in R&P 3.22.1, with program-specific timelines as described in the catalog." The amendment was seconded, put to a vote, and passed.

The amended motion was put to a vote and passed. The approved language is given below.

3.1.8: Normal Academic Progress: Undergraduate
As a benchmark for timely academic progress, students pursuing a baccalaureate degree are generally expected to average 30 or more credit hours per year in order to complete the 120+ credit hours required for graduation within the university's standard four-year timeframe. This benchmark is intended to guide academic progress and should not be construed as establishing or replacing the university's maximum timeframe for degree completion. The university defines a full-time undergraduate course load as carrying between 12 and 18 credit hours each semester. Falling below the 12-credit threshold reduces a student to part-time status, which may delay graduation and affect eligibility for certain services. Normal degree progress requires enrolling in and successfully completing major and/or college requirements each term, as described in R&P 3.8 and program-specific catalog requirements.

The university recognizes that unexpected circumstances may disrupt a student's academic path and provides mechanisms for flexibility. Students may petition the Committee on Standing of Students (SOS) for an approved leave of absence, pursuant to R&P 3.1.4.2 and 3.1.7. An approved leave of absence pauses the consecutive-semester benchmark for timely academic progress. Upon returning from an approved leave, students are expected to resume their academic program and continue progressing toward completion in accordance with the anticipated degree timeline, as applicable.

3.21.8: Normal Academic Progress: Master's and Certificate Programs
The university defines a standard full-time graduate course load as a minimum of nine credit hours per semester. As a benchmark for timely academic progress, students are expected to sequence and complete required core courses, prerequisites, and electives in accordance with the anticipated degree timeline indicated in the university catalog. This benchmark is intended to guide academic planning and should not be construed as establishing or replacing the university's maximum timeframe for degree completion. Full-time status may be maintained with fewer than nine credits of registration after fulfillment of degree credit-hour requirements and continuing a program of full-time study and research. In such cases, the status must be certified each semester on the Graduate Full Time Certification request form, first by the department and then by the appropriate college and filed no later than the 5th day of class in the semester in which certification is requested.

Normal academic progress dictates that specific curricular milestones, which vary by program, are met on schedule each term to avoid delays in graduation. Grade requirements include the following: no final course mark lower than "C-" may be credited toward a graduate degree, and regular students who receive more than four final grades below "B-" will not be permitted to continue their registration without a required time away and reapplying for admission to the program. Note that specific academic program requirements may be more strict. For programs containing a thesis,

research project, or capstone requirement, a critical checkpoint for tracking this advancement is the mandatory annual review, wherein programs must submit a summary of the student's thesis, project, or capstone progress. The progress milestones recorded in the annual review will follow university regulations for Master's programs, as outlined in R&P 3.22.1, with program-specific timelines as described in the catalog.

The university recognizes that unexpected circumstances may disrupt a student's academic path and provides mechanisms for flexibility. Students may petition the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) for an approved leave of absence, pursuant to R&P Section 3.21.7. An approved leave of absence pauses the consecutive-semester benchmark for timely academic progress. Upon returning from an approved leave, students are expected to resume their academic program and continue progressing toward completion in accordance with the anticipated degree timeline, as applicable.

3.21.9: Normal Academic Progress: Doctoral

The university defines a standard full-time graduate course load as a minimum of nine credit hours per semester. As a benchmark for timely academic progress, students are expected to sequence and complete required core courses, prerequisites, and electives in accordance with the anticipated degree timeline indicated in the university catalog. This benchmark is intended to guide academic planning and should not be construed as establishing or replacing the university's maximum timeframe for degree completion. Full-time status may be maintained with fewer than nine credits of registration after fulfillment of degree credit-hour requirements and continuing a program of full-time study and research. In such cases, the status must be certified each semester on the Graduate Full Time Certification request form, first by the department and then by the appropriate college and filed no later than the 5th day of class in the semester in which certification is requested.

To maintain regular student status and demonstrate satisfactory academic progress toward a doctoral degree, a candidate must balance coursework with the completion of research milestones. Students must complete the university requirement of 72 post-baccalaureate credit hours, or a minimum of 48 credit hours for those admitted with an approved prior master's degree, in addition to department requirements and dissertation research. Students must satisfy the grade requirements specified in Section 3.27.1 in order to remain in good academic standing and progress toward the degree.Note that specific academic program requirements may be more strict. Normal progress dictates that students complete foundational 400-level coursework, satisfy departmental qualifying and general examinations on schedule, and officially petition for admission to doctoral candidacy. In addition, for completion of a doctoral degree, a dissertation is required. The dissertation is a substantial body of original, independent research that advances new knowledge within a discipline and demonstrates a scholar's capability to operate as an independent researcher and

authority in their field. Progression through the dissertation is formally monitored via a mandatory annual review checkpoint, wherein programs must submit a summary of the dissertation progress. This annual evaluation reviews research productivity and dissertation benchmarks to ensure consistent progress each year. The progress milestones recorded in the annual review will follow university regulations for doctoral programs, as outlined in R&P 3.23, 3.24, and 3.25, with program-specific timelines as described in the catalog.

The university recognizes that unexpected circumstances may disrupt a student's academic path and provides mechanisms for flexibility. Students may petition the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) for an approved leave of absence, pursuant to R&P Section 3.21.7. An approved leave of absence pauses the consecutive-semester benchmark for timely academic progress. Upon returning from an approved leave, students are expected to resume their academic program and continue progressing toward completion in accordance with the anticipated degree timeline, as applicable.

6. Discussion: Proposal to Raise Explore Lehigh Cap from 30 to 50 for final pilot

Deputy Provost for Undergraduate Studies Terry-Ann Jones provided an update. The details are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/Explore%20Lehigh%20Pilot%20Evaluation%20Findings%20%26%20Key%20Metrics%20for%20FS%20-%20Google%20Docs.pdf

During the discussion, Deputy Provost for Undergraduate Studies Terry-Ann Jones noted that the students are doing well and the proposal to increase is driven by feedback from admissions events, higher numbers will likely increase the variety of majors chosen by the students (in response to questions from Professors Dean Caivano, Anders Knospe, and Rosi Reed about the timing and rationale for the increase), and that resource needs and advising needs for the increased number of students are being considered. Provost Nathan Urban noted that it is difficult to predict the exact demand in the early stages of any program, Lehigh would like to capture the higher level of demand from applicants, admission targets are being set now and hence the need for advance planning (in response to Professor Mike Spear's question about delaying the decision until December). Professor Jenna Lay requested that the faculty teams teaching the students should come from different colleges, so students get adequate exposure to all colleges.

The proposal to increase the cap to 50 was put to a vote and passed.

Respectfully submitted by

K. Sivakumar (“Siva”)
Arthur Tauck Chair and Professor of Marketing
Secretary of the Faculty